

Yorker to whom these figures may be new may stammer out that there are plenty of farm lands in the annexed district, and that all that is necessary is rapid transit beyond the Harlem. There New-York can grow indefinitely. It would be a very simple-minded and ill-informed New-Yorker who should suggest such an idea. The boundless wilderness in the annexed district beyond the Harlem includes precisely 12,317 acres. If they were in absolute solitude, and if the creation of perfect transit were to enable them to be peopled throughout with the density of London, they would accommodate less than the growth of one New-York ward since the last census. But so far from being empty, there are 73,000 persons there now, and perfect transit is indefinitely distant. It is an abhorrent hypothesis that New-York should stop growing. Where, then, are the people to go?

New-York will always attract to itself some who would live elsewhere but for losing the name of citizens of New-York. But, neglecting that uncertain quantity, people will settle according to their convenience. If that convenience — which includes cost, comfort, health, and so on — takes them out of New-York, New-York will lose them, unless she extends her name over them. We think they will leave New-York for the reason that they are doing so. Brooklyn, for instance, is growing faster than New-York. In other words, New-York is in a relative decline because New-York is out of the reach of the average means of persons who won't live in tenements. New-York, which now despises Brooklyn, would do well to adopt her while she is the Cinderella of the family. For, although New-York's commercial supremacy is impregnable, her numerical supremacy, unless she extends her area, will pass from her in a generation and forever.

Mr. CURTIS either ignored these facts or did not consider them important. What he wanted to be informed about was the superior economics and excellences of municipal administration to be attained by consolidation. As Mr. CURTIS is a historian, he can remember before New-York's annexing mood took its course northward, the state of affairs when there were different excise laws for the different ends of the Harlem River bridges. He can also recall, and will not deny its appositeness now, the weary delay in building every northward bridge because of a paltry squabble as to whether New-York or Westchester should bear the expense. About that time he will remember seven independent commissions were engaged in laying out adjacent streets, with a confusion of grades and lines simply perfect from a lawyer's selfish view. And the list of instances might be extended through every imaginable problem of water supply, sewerage, street, bridge, and ferry privileges, and so on. Is it necessary to argue to a person of Mr. CURTIS's acuteness that such matters are better settled for the good of the majority by a single authority than by jealous officials, exercising patched and piecemeal jurisdiction, through every grade of diverse legislative, executive, and judicial functions? Is it better to improve a great estate on a plan or in a happy-go-lucky catch-as-catch-can fashion? If the law should create officers charged with such considerable tasks, is there not a hope of improvement in the character of the municipal officials? If Mr. CURTIS thinks not, will he not, in his capacity as an average citizen, admit that bad officers will do less harm in carrying out a good plan than a bad one? If consolidation would not bring in the millennium and reform Tammany at one swoop, would it not at least bring some advantages of its own, including that of setting Tammany and the Thomas Jeffersonians to watch and checkmate each other in the light of a new publicity? We do not fancy Mr. CURTIS imagines the subject can be settled in the limits of this column, but can he not find here clues which will enable him to speak as a teacher rather than as an inquirer?

GREATER NEW-YORK.

That was a very pointed letter which Mr. GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS wrote to the promoters of the project for extending the area of New-York City. They applied to him as a leader of opinion to tell them what was going on in the public mind regarding the idea of creating a city second to only one in Christendom. And Mr. CURTIS replies, from his suburban villa, that people are not thinking very much about it; and, as for himself, he would like to know what would be the practical benefits. It is to be regretted that Mr. CURTIS abdicated his position as public teacher, and did not in his masterly manner tell people what they ought to think for or against the scheme. Still, his profession of open-mindedness and readiness for conviction upon cause shown was very useful, for it marks accurately the state of public opinion. More than a million people must make up their minds on the subject, but it is perfectly certain that they will no more do it for themselves than did Mr. CURTIS. It is a simple but laborious process to acquaint one's self with the elements of a public problem and then reason to a conclusion. The average citizen won't do that, and there is no reason why he should be expected to. On this subject, as on any other, that duty falls on such men as Mr. CURTIS, who now reduces himself to the ranks, and asks for reasons, instead of giving them.

There are many minor reasons, but the main one is necessity. Men and acres are the raw materials of cities. And New-York has so many more men and so many fewer acres than her rivals that the comparison is startling if viewed with a prophetic eye.

	Population.	Acres.	Persons per acre.
London, (Police District).....	4,764,312	411,587	11
Philadelphia.....	1,046,964	83,200	12
Chicago.....	1,098,576	96,000	11
New-York.....	1,515,301	25,780	59

It thus appears that on one-third the territory of Philadelphia New-York now accommodates a half million more population. Making comparison with London, it appears that while London has seventeen times larger territory it has only about three times greater population. In other words, New-York is approximately on the average throughout its entire area now six times more crowded than London. If the entire area of New-York were settled with the average density of London its population would be under 300,000. The point which is sought to be made is that New-York is full to-day, with no allowance for the demands of to-morrow.

It is quite possible that some dazed New-